

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/045,036	01/15/2002	Toshihiko Tanaka	XA-9613	2902
181	7590 08/18/2004		EXAMINER	
MILES & ST	TOCKBRIDGE PC		PHAN, T	HIEM D
1751 PINNAC SUITE 500	CLE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, V	A 22102-3833		3729	

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\sim V$
Advisory Action	10/045,036	TANAKA ET AL.	O.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tim Phan	3729	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extended the final Office action; or (ension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	,	
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	,
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	i amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 18.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-17 and 1	<u>9</u> .	,	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	/
 10 Other:			
-			
	•		

Continuation/ Note:

Applicants' Remarks filed on July 19th 2004 have been carefully reviewed. The Patent Office construes that the wording "photomask" can be broadly applied in the claim.

New Claim 19 filed on July 19th 2004 raises new issue and affects the scope of the claim in such a manner that it requires further search and/or consideration, since the claims in the Office Actions mailed on March 18th 2004, do not require the scattering of light by the nano-particles as currently amended.

Each dependent claim continues to be rejected as stated in Paper filed March 18th 2004.

CARL J. ARBES
PRIMARY EXAMINER